UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/018,441	03/04/2002	Gerald Burnett	CA1149	4401

23493   7590   03/16/2005

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
401 Castro Street, Ste 220
Mountain View, CA   94041-2007

EXAMINER
SCUDERI, PHILIP S

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2153	

DATE MAILED: 03/16/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	10/018,441	BURNETT ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Philip S. Scuderi	2153	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) FROM
THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>04 March 2002</u>.
2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL.** 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) ☒ Claim(s) <u>1-52</u> is/are pending in the application.
    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) ☒ Claim(s) <u>1-52</u> is/are rejected.
7) ☒ Claim(s) <u>1,31,42 and 43</u> is/are objected to.
8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on <u>04 March 2002</u> is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
    a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
      1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
      2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
      3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Objections

1.   Claims 1, 31, 42, and 43 are objected to because of non-standard indentation.

Examiner sites claims 44 and 52 as examples of properly indented claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

2.   The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

3.   Claims 5, 6, 8, 10, 12, 14, 16, 18, 20, 22-27, 31, 34, 37, and 38 are rejected under

35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out

and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

4.   Claim 5 recites the limitation "the events" in line 1. There is insufficient

antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim since it is unclear exactly which events

the limitation is referring to.

5.   Claims 6, 8, 10, 12, 14, 16, 18, 20, 22, 23, 24, and 27 recite the limitation "the

database" in lines 2, 2, 2, 2, 2, 2, 2, 2, 1, 1, 1, and 3 respectively. There is insufficient

antecedent basis for this limitation in the claims.

6.   Claims 22, 31, and 34 recite the limitation "each database" in lines 2, 2, and 2

respectively. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claims.

Examiner suggests "each localized database".

7.   Claim 26 recites the limitation "the reporting" in line 3. There is insufficient

antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

8.   Claim 37 and 38 recite the limitation "the reporting module" in lines 1 and 2

respectively. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

9.   Claim 6 recites the limitation "the server startup events" in lines 1-2. However,

the events do not necessarily comprise server startup events, rendering the scope of the

claim unclear.

10.   Claim 8 recites the limitation "the server shutdown events" in lines 1-2. However,

the events do not necessarily comprise server shutdown events, rendering the scope of the

claim unclear.

11.   Claim 10 recites the limitation "the user login events" in line 1. However, the

events do not necessarily comprise user login events, rendering the scope of the claim

unclear.

12.   Claim 12 recites the limitation "the user logout events" in line 1. However, the

events do not necessarily comprise user logout events, rendering the scope of the claim

unclear.

13.   Claim 14 recites the limitation "the call events" in line 1. However, the events do

not necessarily comprise call events, rendering the scope of the claim unclear.

14.   Claim 16 recites the limitation "the call error events" in line 1. However, the

events do not necessarily comprise call error events, rendering the scope of the claim

unclear.

15.   Claim 18 recites the limitation "the service events" in line 1. However, the events

do not necessarily comprise service events, rendering the scope of the claim unclear.

16.   Claim 20 recites the limitation "the service error events" in line 1. However, the

events do not necessarily comprise service error events, rendering the scope of the claim

unclear.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

17.   The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that

form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless —
>
> (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

18.   Claims 1, 5, 23, 25-27, 30, 43, 44, 46-49, 51, and 52 are rejected under 35

U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Stewart et al. (US 6389112, hereinafter "Stewart").

19.   With respect to claim 1, Stewart discloses a multimedia collaboration reporting

system for use in at least one underlying multimedia collaboration system network (see

fig. 1), comprising:

an event monitoring module for monitoring service events (fig. 2A #37, 39, col. 6

lines 34-44);

a database module for recording the monitored events therein (fig. 2A #38) and

for classifying the monitored events according to predetermined characteristics and

attributes (see table 1); and

a reporting module (fig. 1 #28) for receiving query parameter information from a

user (A user transmits query parameter information by selecting a reporting option as

shown in fig. 6 #302.) and for generating a report in accordance with the query parameter

information (col. 14 lines 49-53).

20.   With respect to claim 5, Stewart discloses the multimedia collaboration reporting

system applied to claim 1. As discussed above, the events include one or more service

events.

21.   With respect to claim 23, Stewart discloses the multimedia collaboration reporting

system applied to claim 1. Stewart further discloses a centrally located database module

configured to maintain the monitored event information (fig. 1 #23).

22.   With respect to claim 25, Stewart discloses the multimedia collaboration reporting

system applied to claim 1. Steward further discloses that the reporting module is

configured to generate standard reports relating to the operation of the multimedia

collaboration system network in response to the query parameter information (fig. 6

#302).

23.   With respect to claim 26, Stewart discloses the multimedia collaboration reporting

system applied to claim 1. Steward further discloses that the reporting module includes a

web-based interface (see fig. 1 #32, 34 and fig. 6) for providing response interactivity

such that a database query can be formulated and provided via the Internet (By selecting

a particular type of report as shown in fig. 6 #310-320 the user is formulating a database

query (the request) via the Internet.).

24.   With respect to claim 27, Stewart discloses the multimedia collaboration reporting

system applied to claim 1. The reporting module must inherently either perform

predetermined calculations or conditional tests on the event information in order to generate the report.

25.   With respect to claim 28, Stewart discloses the multimedia collaboration reporting system applied to claim 1. Steward further discloses that the report is formulated as a machine readable report file (fig. 7).

26.   With respect to claim 30, Stewart discloses the multimedia collaboration reporting system applied to claim 1. Steward further discloses that the report is formulated as a combination of textual and graphical data (see fig. 7, Textual data is graphical data when displayed by a browser or other application.).

27.   With respect to claim 43, Stewart discloses a method for generating reports identifying multimedia collaboration system events, comprising the steps of:

monitoring internal network system events (col. 6 lines 22-29) and recording the monitored events to a database (col. 7 lines 17-20), the stored events being classified in the database according to a predetermined set of characteristics and attributes (see table 1);

querying the database with a set of query parameter information to generate an analysis report (A user queries the database with a set of query parameter information to generate an analysis report by selecting a reporting option as shown in fig. 6 #302.); and

generating the analysis report in accordance with the query parameter information (see fig. 7).

28.   With respect to claim 44, Stewart discloses a reporting system, comprising:

a network control system configured to monitor internal event information of a multimedia collaboration system network (col. 6 lines 22-29);

a database configured to store the monitored event information (fig. 1 #24, col. 7

lines 17-20);

a database query system configured to format a database query according to query

parameter information and to query the database in accordance with the database query

parameter information (A user queries the database with a set of query parameter

information by selecting a reporting option as shown in fig. 6 #302.); and

a report generation system configured to generate an analysis report from the

monitored event information stored in the database in accordance with the database query

parameter information (col. 14 lines 49-53).

29.   With respect to claim 46, Stewart discloses the reporting system applied to claim

44. Steward further discloses that the report generation system is configured to generate

standard reports relating to the operation of the multimedia collaboration system network

in response to the database query parameter information (fig. 6 #302).

30.   With respect to claim 47, Stewart discloses the reporting system applied to claim

44. Steward further discloses that the reporting module includes a web-based interface

(see fig. 1 #32, 34 and fig. 6) for providing response interactivity such that a database

query can be formulated and provided via the Internet (By selecting a particular type of

report as shown in fig. 6 #310-320 the user is formulating a database query (the request)

via the Internet.).

31.   With respect to claim 48, Stewart discloses the reporting system applied to claim

44. The reporting module must inherently either perform predetermined calculations or

conditional tests on the event information in order to generate a report.

32.   With respect to claim 49, Stewart discloses the reporting system applied to claim

44. Steward further discloses that the report is formulated as a machine readable report

file (fig. 7).

33.   With respect to claim 51, Stewart discloses the reporting system applied to claim

44. Steward further discloses that the report is formulated as a combination of textual and

graphical data (see fig. 7, Textual data is graphical data when displayed by a browser or

other application.).

34.   With respect to claim 52, Stewart discloses a reporting system, comprising:

        a network control system configured to monitor internal event information of a

multimedia collaboration system network (col. 6 lines 22-29);

        a database configured to store the monitored event information (fig. 1 #24, col. 7

lines 17-20);

        a web-based (see fig. 1 #32, 34) database query system configured to format a

database query according to query parameter information and to query the database in

accordance with the database query parameter information (A user queries the database

with a set of query parameter information by selecting a reporting option as shown in fig.

6 #302.); and

        a report generation system configured to generate an analysis report from the

monitored event information stored in the database in accordance with the database query

parameter information (col. 14 lines 49-53).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

35.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
> forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
> the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
> invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

36.   Claims 2-4, 6-22, 24, 28, 31-39, 41, and 42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as

being unpatentable over Stewart in view of Grabelsky et al. (US 6678250, hereinafter

"Grabelsky").

37.   With respect to claim 2, Stewart discloses the multimedia collaboration reporting

system applied to claim 1. Stewart does not expressly disclose a plurality of multimedia

collaboration system networks and wherein one of the modules is centralized to a

particular one of the plurality of multimedia collaboration system networks. However,

Stewart discloses that the network configuration disclosed in figure 1 has been greatly

simplified for ease of illustration (col. 3 lines 42-52). In a similar art, Grabelsky discloses

a plurality of multimedia collaboration system networks arranged in a hierarchy (col. 8

lines 37-55). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use the

hierarchical network structure disclosed by Grabelsky so that the network disclosed by

Stewart in fig. 1 would be the top level of the network hierarchy. The motivation for

doing so would have been so that the network processing could be distributed and the

processing burden could be placed at the appropriate network monitor (Grabelsky col. 2

line 65 – col. 3 line 2). Grabelsky further discloses monitored event data being passed up

the network hierarchy (col. 8 lines 60-65). Therefore, the instant modification would

facilitate the monitored event data being passed up the network hierarchy for collection

by the reporting module (Stewart fig. 1 #23), which is centralized, to the top level of the

network hierarchy (one of the plurality of multimedia collaboration system networks).

38.   With respect to claim 3, Stewart discloses the multimedia collaboration reporting

system applied to claim 1. Stewart does not expressly disclose a plurality of multimedia

collaboration system networks and wherein one of the modules is centralized to a

particular one of the plurality of multimedia collaboration system networks. However,

Stewart discloses that the network configuration disclosed in figure 1 has been greatly

simplified for ease of illustration (col. 3 lines 42-52). In a similar art, Grabelsky discloses

a plurality of multimedia collaboration system networks arranged in a hierarchy (col. 8

lines 37-55). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use the

hierarchical network structure disclosed by Grabelsky so that the network disclosed by

Stewart in fig. 1 would be the top level of the network hierarchy. The motivation for

doing so would have been so that the network processing could be distributed and the

processing burden could be placed at the appropriate network monitor (Grabelsky col. 2

line 65 – col. 3 line 2). Grabelsky further discloses that each gateway includes a database

to collect monitored events (col. 5 lines 54-57). Therefore, the instant modification would

facilitate the database module being decentralized by being distributed among the

plurality of multimedia collaboration system networks.

39.   With respect to claim 4, Stewart in view of Grabelsky teaches the multimedia

collaboration reporting system applied to claim 3. As discussed above, each gateway

includes a database to collect monitored events. Therefore, the decentralization of the

database module results in a first network architecture that mirrors a network

architecture, which is common to the network architecture of the top level multimedia collaboration system network.

40.   With respect to claim 6, Stewart in view of Grabelsky teaches the multimedia collaboration reporting system applied to claim 5. Stewart further discloses that the service events comprise server startup events (col. 6 lines 14-20, An originating terminal is a server because it serves information to a destination terminal in the course of a call.). As discussed above, the service events are stored in the database module. The location that the service events are stored in the database module is a startup record.

41.   With respect to claim 7, Stewart in view of Grabelsky teaches the multimedia collaboration reporting system applied to claim 6. Stewart further discloses that storing information in the log includes storing supplemental information (col. 11 lines 1-4).

42.   With respect to claim 8, Stewart in view of Grabelsky teaches the multimedia collaboration reporting system applied to claim 5. Examiner takes Official Notice that it was well known in the art to log server shutdown events. Given this information it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to log server shutdown events in the database module. The motivation for doing so would have been to provide node histories as shown in fig. 6 #374.

43.   With respect to claim 9, Stewart in view of Grabelsky teaches the multimedia collaboration reporting system applied to claim 8. Stewart further discloses that storing information in the log includes storing supplemental information (col. 11 lines 1-4).

44.   With respect to claim 10, Stewart in view of Grabelsky teaches the multimedia collaboration reporting system applied to claim 5. Stewart further discloses that the service events comprise user login events (table 1 "info session logon"). As discussed

above, the service events are stored in the database module. The location that the service

events are stored in the database module is a user login record.

45.   With respect to claim 11, Stewart in view of Grabelsky teaches the multimedia

collaboration reporting system applied to claim 10. Stewart further discloses that storing

information in the log includes storing supplemental information (col. 11 lines 1-4).

46.   With respect to claim 12, Stewart in view of Grabelsky teaches the multimedia

collaboration reporting system applied to claim 5. Stewart further discloses that the

service events comprise user logout events (table 1 "info session logoff"). As discussed

above, the service events are stored in the database module. The location that the service

events are stored in the database module is a user login record.

47.   With respect to claim 13, Stewart in view of Grabelsky teaches the multimedia

collaboration reporting system applied to claim 12. Stewart further discloses that storing

information in the log includes storing supplemental information (col. 11 lines 1-4).

48.   With respect to claim 14, Stewart in view of Grabelsky teaches the multimedia

collaboration reporting system applied to claim 5. Stewart further discloses that the

service events comprise call events (col. 6 lines 14-20). As discussed above, the service

events are stored in the database module. The location that the service events are stored in

the database module is a call record.

49.   With respect to claim 15, Stewart in view of Grabelsky teaches the multimedia

collaboration reporting system applied to claim 14. Stewart further discloses that storing

information in the log includes storing timing information (col. 11 lines 1-4).

50.   With respect to claim 16, Stewart in view of Grabelsky teaches the multimedia

collaboration reporting system applied to claim 5. Stewart further discloses that the

service events comprise call error events (table 1 "info abnormal termination"). As

discussed above, the service events are stored in the database module. The location that

the service events are stored in the database module is a call error record.

51.   With respect to claim 17, Stewart in view of Grabelsky teaches the multimedia

collaboration reporting system applied to claim 16. Stewart further discloses that storing

information in the log includes storing timing information (col. 11 lines 1-4).

52.   With respect to claim 18, Stewart in view of Grabelsky teaches the multimedia

collaboration reporting system applied to claim 5. As discussed above, the service events

are stored in the database module. The location that the service events are stored in the

database module is a service record.

53.   With respect to claim 19, Stewart in view of Grabelsky teaches the multimedia

collaboration reporting system applied to claim 18. Stewart further discloses that storing

information in the log includes storing timing information (col. 11 lines 1-4).

54.   With respect to claim 20, Stewart in view of Grabelsky teaches the multimedia

collaboration reporting system applied to claim 5. Stewart further discloses that the

service events comprise service error events (table 1 "info abnormal termination"). As

discussed above, the service events are stored in the database module. The location that

the service events are stored in the database module is a service error record.

55.   With respect to claim 21, Stewart in view of Grabelsky teaches the multimedia

collaboration reporting system applied to claim 20. Stewart further discloses that storing

information in the log includes storing timing information (col. 11 lines 1-4).

56.   With respect to claim 22, Stewart discloses the multimedia collaboration reporting

system applied to claim 1. Stewart does not expressly disclose that the database module

comprises a plurality of localized databases, each localized database configured to store

the monitored event information from a particular multimedia collaboration system

network and a centralized database configured to centrally maintain the stored

information from each of the plurality of localized databases. However, Stewart discloses

that the network configuration disclosed in figure 1 has been greatly simplified for ease

of illustration (col. 3 lines 42-52). In a similar art, Grabelsky discloses a plurality of

multimedia collaboration system networks arranged in a hierarchy (col. 8 lines 37-55). It

would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use the hierarchical network

structure disclosed by Grabelsky so that the network disclosed by Stewart in fig. 1 would

be the top level of the network hierarchy. The motivation for doing so would have been

so that the network processing could be distributed and the processing burden could be

placed at the appropriate network monitor (Grabelsky col. 2 line 65 – col. 3 line 2).

Grabelsky further discloses that each gateway includes a database configured to store

monitored event information from a particular multimedia collaboration system (col. 5

lines 54-57). Therefore, the instant modification would facilitate the database module

being decentralized by being distributed among the plurality of multimedia collaboration

system networks. Grabelsky further discloses the monitored event data being passed up

the network hierarchy (col. 8 lines 60-65). Therefore, the instant modification would

facilitate the monitored event data being passed up the network hierarchy for collection

by the reporting module (Stewart fig. 1 #23), which is configured to centrally maintain

the stored information (Stewart fig. 1 "Central Data Collection, Processing and Storage

Unit").

57.   With respect to claim 24, Stewart discloses the multimedia collaboration reporting

system applied to claim 1. Stewart does not expressly disclose that the database module

comprises a plurality of localized databases, each database configured to store the

monitored event information from a particular multimedia collaboration system network.

However, Stewart discloses that the network configuration disclosed in figure 1 has been

greatly simplified for ease of illustration (col. 3 lines 42-52). In a similar art, Grabelsky

discloses a plurality of multimedia collaboration system networks arranged in a hierarchy

(col. 8 lines 37-55). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use

the hierarchical network structure disclosed by Grabelsky so that the network disclosed

by Stewart in fig. 1 would be the top level of the network hierarchy. The motivation for

doing so would have been so that the network processing could be distributed and the

processing burden could be placed at the appropriate network monitor (Grabelsky col. 2

line 65 – col. 3 line 2). Grabelsky further discloses that each gateway includes a database

configured to store monitored event information from a particular multimedia

collaboration network (col. 5 lines 54-57). Therefore, the instant modification would

facilitate each gateway including a database configured to store monitored event

information from a particular multimedia collaboration network.

58.   With respect to claim 31, Stewart discloses a multimedia collaboration system for

conducting a conference among a plurality of participants comprising:

        a multimedia collaboration system network (fig. 1 #10), including

        a plurality of workstations each having reproduction capabilities for capturing and

reproducing spoken audio of the participants (fig. 1 # 14, 16);

a data network providing a data path along which data can be shared among the

plurality of the workstations (fig. 1 #10, col. 3 lines 41-42); and

a data conference manager for managing the sharing of data between the plurality

of workstations (any switch in the path between the originating and destination

terminals); and

an independent reporting system connected with the multimedia collaboration

system network (fig. 1 #23, 28) and configured to provide reporting analysis of the

multimedia collaboration system network (see figures 6 and 7), the independent system

including

a network control system configured to monitor internal event information

affecting the multimedia collaboration system network (fig. 1 #22, col. 7 lines 17-20);

a database configured to store the monitored event information (fig. 1 #24);

a database query system configured to format a database query according to query

parameter information (A user transmits query parameter information by selecting a

reporting option as shown in fig. 6 #302.) and to query the database in accordance with

the database query parameter information (col. 14 lines 49-53); and

a report generation system configured to generate an analysis report from the

monitored event information stored in the database in accordance with the database query

parameter information (see fig. 7).

Stewart does not disclose the plurality of workstations each having a monitor for

displaying visual images and A/V capture and reproduction capabilities for capturing and

reproducing video images of the participants. Nonetheless, using such a network for

video conferencing was well known, as evidenced by Grabelsky. In a similar art,

Grabelsky discloses a network adapted to provide video conferencing comprising a

plurality of workstations (fig. 1 #17, 18) each having a monitor for displaying visual

images and A/V capture and reproduction capabilities for capturing and reproducing

video images of participants (see fig. 1, col. 2 lines 28-29). Given the teachings of

Grabelsky it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to provide each

of the plurality of workstations with a monitor for displaying visual images and A/V

capture and reproduction capabilities for capturing and reproducing video images and

spoken audio of the participants. The motivation for doing so would have been to satisfy

the needs of multiple participant multimedia conferences (col. 5 lines 8-11).

59.   With respect to claim 32, Stewart in view of Grabelsky teaches the multimedia

collaboration reporting system applied to claim 31. Stewart does not expressly disclose

that the database comprises a plurality of localized databases, each localized database

configured to store the monitored event information from a particular multimedia

collaboration system network and a centralized database configured to centrally maintain

the stored information from each of the plurality of localized databases. However,

Stewart discloses that the network configuration disclosed in figure 1 has been greatly

simplified for ease of illustration (col. 3 lines 42-52). In a similar art, Grabelsky further

discloses a plurality of multimedia collaboration system networks arranged in a hierarchy

(col. 8 lines 37-55). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use

the hierarchical network structure disclosed by Grabelsky so that the network disclosed

by Stewart in fig. 1 would be the top level of the network hierarchy. The motivation for

doing so would have been so that the network processing could be distributed and the

processing burden could be placed at the appropriate network monitor (Grabelsky col. 2

line 65 – col. 3 line 2). Grabelsky further discloses that each gateway includes a database

configured to store monitored event information from a particular multimedia

collaboration system (col. 5 lines 54-57). Therefore, the instant modification would

facilitate the database module being decentralized by being distributed among the

plurality of multimedia collaboration system networks. Grabelsky further discloses the

monitored event data being passed up the network hierarchy (col. 8 lines 60-65).

Therefore, the instant modification would facilitate the monitored event data being passed

up the network hierarchy for collection by the reporting module (Stewart fig. 1 #23),

which is configured to centrally maintain the stored information (Stewart fig. 1 "Central

Data Collection, Processing and Storage Unit").

60.   With respect to claim 33, Stewart in view of Grabelsky teaches the multimedia

collaboration reporting system applied to claim 31. Stewart further discloses a centrally

located database module configured to maintain the monitored event information (fig. 1

#23).

61.   With respect to claim 34, Stewart in view of Grabelsky teaches the multimedia

collaboration reporting system applied to claim 31. Stewart does not expressly disclose

that the database comprises a plurality of localized databases, each database configured to

store the monitored event information from a particular multimedia collaboration system

network. However, Stewart discloses that the network configuration disclosed in figure 1

has been greatly simplified for ease of illustration (col. 3 lines 42-52). In a similar art,

Grabelsky further discloses a plurality of multimedia collaboration system networks

arranged in a hierarchy (col. 8 lines 37-55). It would have been obvious to one of

ordinary skill in the art to use the hierarchical network structure disclosed by Grabelsky

so that the network disclosed by Stewart in fig. 1 would be the top level of the network

hierarchy. The motivation for doing so would have been so that the network processing

could be distributed and the processing burden could be placed at the appropriate network

monitor (Grabelsky col. 2 line 65 – col. 3 line 2). Grabelsky further discloses that each

gateway includes a database configured to store monitored event information from a

particular multimedia collaboration network (col. 5 lines 54-57). Therefore, the instant

modification would facilitate each gateway including a database configured to store

monitored event information from a particular multimedia collaboration network.

62.   With respect to claim 35, Stewart in view of Grabelsky teaches the multimedia

collaboration reporting system applied to claim 31. Stewart does not expressly disclose

that the database query system includes a general filter formatter. However, a general

filter formatter reads on a SQL query engine, which was very well known to be a very

common database feature.

63.   With respect to claim 36, Stewart in view of Grabelsky teaches the multimedia

collaboration reporting system applied to claim 31. Steward further discloses that the

reporting module is configured to generate standard reports relating to the operation of

the multimedia collaboration system network in response to the database query parameter

information (fig. 6 #302).

64.   With respect to claim 37, Stewart in view of Grabelsky teaches the multimedia

collaboration reporting system applied to claim 31. Steward further discloses that the

reporting module includes a web-based interface (see fig. 1 #32, 34 and fig. 6) for

providing response interactivity such that a database query can be formulated and

provided via the Internet (By selecting a particular type of report as shown in fig. 6 #310-320 the user is formulating a database query (the request) via the Internet.).

65.   With respect to claim 38, Stewart in view of Grabelsky teaches the multimedia collaboration reporting system applied to claim 31. The reporting module must inherently either perform predetermined calculations or conditional tests on the event information in order to generate a report.

66.   With respect to claim 39, Stewart in view of Grabelsky teaches the multimedia collaboration reporting system applied to claim 31. Steward further discloses that the report is formulated as a machine readable report file (fig. 7).

67.   With respect to claim 41, Stewart in view of Grabelsky teaches the multimedia collaboration reporting system applied to claim 31. Steward further discloses that the report is formulated as a combination of textual and graphical data (see fig. 7, Textual data is graphical data when displayed by a browser or other application.).

68.   With respect to claim 42, Stewart discloses a multimedia collaboration system for conducting a conference among a plurality of participants comprising:

a multimedia collaboration system network (fig. 1 #10), including

a plurality of workstations each having reproduction capabilities for capturing and reproducing spoken audio of the participants (fig. 1 # 14, 16);

a data network providing a data path along which data can be shared among the plurality of the workstations (fig. 1 #10, col. 3 lines 41-42); and

a data conference manager for managing the sharing of data between the plurality of workstations (any switch in the path between the originating and destination terminals); and

an independent reporting system connected with the multimedia collaboration

system network (fig. 1 #23, 28) and configured to provide reporting analysis of the

multimedia collaboration system network (see figures 6 and 7), the independent system

including

a network control system configured to monitor internal event information

affecting the multimedia collaboration system network (fig. 1 #22, col. 7 lines 17-20);

a database configured to store the monitored event information (fig. 1 #24);

a web-based (see fig. 1 #32, 34) database query system configured to format a

database query according to query parameter information (A user transmits query

parameter information by selecting a reporting option as shown in fig. 6 #302.) and to

query the database in accordance with the database query parameter information (col. 14

lines 49-53); and

a report generation system configured to generate an analysis report from the

monitored event information stored in the database in accordance with the database query

parameter information (see fig. 7).

Stewart does not disclose the plurality of workstations each having a monitor for

displaying visual images and A/V capture and reproduction capabilities for capturing and

reproducing video images of the participants. Nonetheless, using such a network for

video conferencing was well known, as evidenced by Grabelsky. In a similar art,

Grabelsky discloses a network adapted to provide video conferencing comprising a

plurality of workstations (fig. 1 #17, 18) each having a monitor for displaying visual

images and A/V capture and reproduction capabilities for capturing and reproducing

video images of participants (see fig. 1, col. 2 lines 28-29). Given the teachings of

Grabelsky it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to provide each

of the plurality of workstations with a monitor for displaying visual images and A/V

capture and reproduction capabilities for capturing and reproducing video images and

spoken audio of the participants. The motivation for doing so would have been to satisfy

the needs of multiple participant multimedia conferences (col. 5 lines 8-11).

69.   Claims 29 and 40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Stewart in view of Ditmer et al. (US 6,490,620, hereinafter "Ditmer").

70.   With respect to claim 29, Stewart discloses the multimedia collaboration reporting

system applied to claim 28. Stewart does not disclose that the report is formulated as a

comma separated value report file. Nonetheless, formulating a network report as a

comma separated report value report file was well known, as evidenced by Ditmer. In a

similar art, Ditmer discloses formulating a network report (col. 19 lines 35-43) as a

comma separated report value report file (col. 19 lines 53-56, CSV is a comma separated

report format.). Given the teachings of Ditmer it would have been obvious to one of

ordinary skill in the art to formulate the report as a comma separated value report file.

The motivation for doing so would have been because the CSV format allows for a data

table to be easily read by a variety of applications.

71.   With respect to claim 50, Stewart discloses the reporting system applied to claim

44. Stewart does not disclose that the report is formulated as a comma separated value

report file. Nonetheless, formulating a network report as a comma separated report value

report file was well known, as evidenced by Ditmer. In a similar art, Ditmer discloses

formulating a network report (col. 19 lines 35-43) as a comma separated report value

report file (col. 19 lines 53-56, CSV is a comma separated report format.). Given the

teachings of Ditmer it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to

formulate the report as a comma separated value report file. The motivation for doing so

would have been because the CSV format allows for a data table to be easily read by a

variety of applications.

72.   Claim 40 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stewart in

view of Grabelsky, and further in view of Ditmer.

73.   With respect to claim 40, Stewart in view of Grabelsky teaches the multimedia

collaboration reporting system applied to claim 39. Stewart does not disclose that the

report is formulated as a comma separated value report file. Nonetheless, formulating a

network report as a comma separated report value report file was well known, as

evidenced by Ditmer. In a similar art, Ditmer discloses formulating a network report (col.

19 lines 35-43) as a comma separated report value report file (col. 19 lines 53-56, CSV is

a comma separated report format.). Given the teachings of Ditmer it would have been

obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to formulate the report as a comma separated

value report file. The motivation for doing so would have been because the CSV format

allows for a data table to be easily read by a variety of applications.

74.   Claim 45 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stewart.

75.   With respect to claim 45, Stewart discloses the reporting system applied to claim

44. Stewart does not expressly disclose that the database query system includes a general

filter formatter. However, a general filter formatter reads on a SQL query engine, which

was very well known to be a very common database feature.

Conclusion

76.   The following prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent

to applicant's disclosure: Turner (US 4484326); Zazzera (US 5511117); Ochy P. et al.

(US 5555297); Morrison et al. (US 5623540); Zazzera (US 5715307); Stein et al. (US

5793951); Grau et al. (US 5818906); Hartmeier (US 5864616); Bellovin et al. (US

5870557); Bouvier et al. (US 5961594); Sears (US 6098101); Cutrell et al. (US

6141777); Booman et al. (US 6216169); Wolf et al. (US 6278694); Siow et al. (US

6301590); Porras et al. (US 6321338); Chafe (US Pub 2001/0054097); Hartmeier (US

6404883); Porras et al. (US 6484203); Stein et al. (US Pub 2003/0191833); Porras et al.

(US Pub 2003/0212903); Gobin et al. (US 6745229); and Ludwig et al. (US 6816904).

77.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Philip S. Scuderi whose telephone number is (571) 272-

5865. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 8am-5pm.

78.   If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Glenton B. Burgess can be reached on (703) 305-4792. The fax phone

number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-

9306.

79.   Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status

information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For

more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you

have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business

Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

PSS